

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2005. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1-22, 24-46, and 48-50 were pending in the Application. Applicants amend Claims 1, 3, 21, 27, and 46 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants' amendments have been done to advance prosecution in this case and not to overcome prior art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections

The Examiner made an objection to Claims 1, 3, and 21 specifically identifying typographical errors. *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicants have corrected these typographical errors to address the Examiner's objection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1, 3, and 21.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12, 24-25, 27-31, 33, 35-38, and 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,828,666 issued to Focsaneanu et al. (hereinafter “Focsaneanu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,736 issued to Mittra (hereinafter “Mittra”). The Examiner rejects Claims 5 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,154 issued to Brown (hereinafter “Brown”). The Examiner rejects Claims 8 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,294 issued to Shaffer et al. (hereinafter “Shaffer”). The Examiner rejects Claims 13-14 and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,152 issued to Gerszberg et al. (hereinafter “Gerszberg”). The Examiner rejects Claims 15-16, 18, 26, 41-43, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,215,483 issued to Zigmond (hereinafter “Zigmond”). The Examiner rejects Claims 19-20 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of *Zigmond* and U.S. Patent

No. 5,805,154 issued to Brown (hereinafter “*Brown*”). The Examiner rejects Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,094 issued to Boys (hereinafter “*Boys*”). The Examiner rejects Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,917 issued to Creamer et al. (hereinafter “*Creamer*”) and *Boys*. The Examiner rejects Claims 21 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focsaneanu* in view of *Mittra* as applied to Claims 1 and 27, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,900 issued to Ensor et al., (hereinafter “*Ensor*”). “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j) (citing *Ex Parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner does not present either to support the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each limitation recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. For example, neither *Focsaneanu* nor *Mittra*, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest “assigning customer premises to multicast domains to support conditional access of the customer premises to content that is selected from the group consisting of selected television programming, video-on-demand, pay-per-view video, near-video-on-demand, audio channels, audio-on-demand, and interactive gaming, wherein the conditional access is implemented using interdiction.” Therefore, *Focsaneanu* and *Mittra*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 21, 27, and 46 each recite certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, *Focsaneanu* and *Mittra*, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 21, 27, and 46 together with their dependents.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Barton E. Showalter at 214.953.6509.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, if this is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Barton E. Showalter
Reg. No. 38,302

Date: Jan 12, 2006

Customer No. **05073**